

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In the Application of: PRINCE)	Group Art Unit: 3737
)	
Serial No: 10/808,693)	Examiner: Lamprecht, J.
)	
Filed: MARCH 25, 2004)	
)	
Title: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR MAGNETIC)	
RESONANCE IMAGING USING CONTRAST)	
AGENTS)	

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE TO REQUIREMENT FOR INFORMATION

Sir:

Applicant responds to the Requirement for Information mailed Nov. 13, 2008.

The Examiner required Applicant to list "all co-pending applications and related patents . . . and identify the specific claims of those applications and/or patents which may present double patenting issues with the instant application claims." The Examiner provided a "non-exhaustive" list of "possible related co-pending applications and patents" including 7110806, 6937883, 6889072, 6879853, 6754521, 6741881, 6662038, 6564085, 6463318, 6311085, 6278892, 6243600, 6240311, 6230041, 5924987, 5799649, 5792056, 5762065, 5746208, 5579767, 5553619, and 5417213.

Applicant finds the request unclear because he cannot understand what the Examiner means by “related” or by “specific claims . . . which may present double patenting issues.”

For the sole purpose of responding to the requirement, Applicant considers a patent or co-pending application to be “related” to the present application if it shares any common priority claim with the present application. The following patents and copending applications are “related” on that basis to the present application:

5,417,213	5,762,065	6,243,600	6,754,521
5,553,619	5,792,056	6,278,892	6,889,072
5,579,767	5,799,649	6,463,318	7,110,806
5,590,654	6,230,041	6,662,038	10/809,835
5,746,208	6,240,311	6,741,881	11/493,055

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s contention that patent nos. 6,937,883, 6,879,853, 6,564,085, 6,311,085, and 5,924,987 are “related.” They have no common priority claim with the instant application and so are not related.

Regarding “specific claims . . . which may present double patenting issues,” the Examiner is in a perfectly adequate position to consider the claims in the “related” cases because they are all published and readily accessed through full-text databases. And while Applicant intends to make reasonable efforts to advance prosecution of this application, he respectfully declines to perform the Examiner’s function of pointing out claims which “may present double patenting issues.” For the sole purpose of responding to the requirement, Applicant states his view that the claims pending in the

present application are patentably distinct over all claims of the “related” cases and that no claims in the “related” cases “may present double patenting issues.”

Applicant declines to file any terminal disclaimers at this time.

Respectfully submitted,
Foley Hoag LLP

Date: January 13, 2009

/SCOTT E. KAMHOLZ/
Scott E. Kamholz, Reg. No. 48,543
Attorney for Applicant